

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

RICHARD WEDDLE,)	3:14-cv-00241-MMD-WGC
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u>
)	
vs.)	June 25, 2015
)	
RENEE BAKER, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: KATIE LYNN OGDEN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Before the court is Plaintiff's May 8, 2015 "Motion for Order Compelling Disclosure or Discovery; Sanctions." (Doc. # 38.) Defendants have responded. (Doc. # 47.) No reply memorandum was filed.

Plaintiff seeks the court to issue an order to Defendants to cooperate in discovery or to impose sanctions. (Doc. # 38 at 1.) Plaintiff states he mailed his last discovery to Defendants on March 26, 2015. (*Id.*, at 1-2.) On May 1, 2015, not having received any responses, Plaintiff wrote to counsel for defendants "requesting cooperation in discovery." This, he states, is his "good faith conferred or attempted to confer...in an effort to obtain [discovery] without court action." (*Id.*, at 2.)

Defendants assert that Plaintiff's May 1, 2015 letter (Exhibit A, Doc.# 47-1) was received on May 6, 2015, and that the very next day defense counsel arranged a telephone conference with Plaintiff for May 12, 2015, to discuss Plaintiff's correspondence and Defendants' discovery responses. During the May 12, 2015 telephone conference, counsel for Defendants informed Plaintiff of a calendaring error and assured him they were diligently working to provide him his discovery requests. (Doc. # 47 at 2.)

///
///

MINUTES OF THE COURT

3:14-cv-00241-MMD-WGC

Date: June 25, 2015

Page 2

Defendants' response asserts that Plaintiff's motion is now moot as Defendants have responded to each of Plaintiff's discovery requests. (*Id.*) Defendants have attached as Exhibit B the various discovery responses of Defendants Stogner, Deal, Sandoval, Youngblood, Baker and Moore to their response. (Doc. # 47-2.)

As stated above, Plaintiff did not reply to the Defendants' response. The court assumes Plaintiff has received the discovery Defendants reference. Therefore, the component of Plaintiff's motion which seeks an order compelling the Defendants to respond to his discovery is moot.

Plaintiff's motion to compel (Doc. # 38) is **DENIED AS MOOT**. The court finds there is no basis for an imposition of sanctions and this component of Plaintiff's motion is **DENIED**.

Plaintiff's motion having been resolved herein, the court **VACATES** the status conference scheduled for June 30, 2015, at 2:00 p.m.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

By: _____ /s/
Deputy Clerk